



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

should be replaced by *se déguiser*.—Under *entendre* the reference 445,26, is to an indicative, not an imperative mood.—*Graver* (294,26) should be explained by *crever*.

In the passage: *sor ce que je ne li veoie droit* (359,16), where BARTSCH translates *sor ce que* by *bien que*, the verb would seem to belong to *veër* VETARE, and not to VIDERE.—In the Text at 205,14, *volroit* suggests itself for *valroit*; and at 293,23 the sense requires *Jesus for desus*. *Que* (suggested by the MS. fr. 871) seems a better reading than *qu'il*, at 644,18. So also read *soy* for *li* in 648,21.

I would suggest also: *honneur et joie faute font* in 664,7 where BARTSCH reads *faut et font*. The latter reading is by no means inadmissible, but the phrase *faire faute* seems to give better sense, and is more in accord with strict observance of concords*.

FREDERIC SPENCER.

University of North Wales, Bangor.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CHEAP TEXTS.

Apropos of Prof. SCHELE DE VERE's new edition of 'L'Avare.'†

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—With the first number of his new series of "Classiques Français" Mr. Jenkins seems to me to have made a move in the right direction,—a move which will have no little influence on the future publication of French and German Texts to be used in our Colleges and High Schools. Some of us have long protested against the high prices charged by American publishers for annotated French and German texts as compared with the prices paid in France and Germany. Moreover, many of the texts published some ten or fifteen years ago were worthless as class-

*In his elaborate review of the work in question (*Rom.* xviii, p. 139) M. GASTON PARIS remarks: "Je ne comprends pas *touz m'i* [the text reads incorrectly *m'i*] *tal* (ou *tel*) au v. 301, 19 [read 301, 21] et le glossaire ne renvoie pas à ce mot." *Tal*, however, is given in the glossary as the present indic. of *tolir*, with a reference to this verse; and it seems possible—though somewhat strained—to translate the passage accordingly.—H. A. T.

† 'L'Avare,' with profuse Historical, Philological, Idiomatic and descriptive Notes by SCHELE DE VERE. New York, 1889. 12mo, pp. vii, 161. William R. Jenkins. Price 20 cents.

books; the notes were insufficient and afforded so little assistance to the student that I, for one, found it just as well, in many cases, to use in my German classes the texts published by Reclam of Leipsic, which cost but a trifle and rendered just as good service.

But within a few years an important change has taken place, due in great part to the influence of the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION. The texts published at present are, in general, well selected and have good notes, appropriate to the class of students for whom they are destined; in short, the day of the joblot manufacture of French and German grammars and text-books is well nigh over.

The present edition of 'L'Avare' is a tasty duodecimo volume, well printed on good paper. Of the 168 pages, 51 are filled with notes. The retail price of the volume is *twenty cents*.

'L'Avare' has been edited and annotated often, both in this country and in Europe, and it is not an easy matter to improve on some of the German and French editions; yet MR. SCHELE DE VERE has placed his stamp on the notes, and his long experience as a teacher has enabled him to see just when and where the American student is in need of assistance. In short, the present edition of 'L'Avare' does credit in many ways to editor and publisher, and both deserve the thanks and encouragement of all teachers of French. It must, however, be said that students will need to be cautioned against some of the etymologies so freely offered. In glancing over the notes, several corrections of statement suggest themselves, and a number of typographical errors (always unavoidable, it seems, in a first edition) remain to be rectified.

In the Notes to—

Page 5—1. 15. For *auxquelles* read *auquel*.

9—1. 21. "Now *cécité* is used." *Cécité* is certainly never used, in a figurative sense, by any good author, the grammarians to the contrary notwithstanding.

11—1. 1. "*J'en vois beaucoup*."—"I see much of her, etc." *En* does not refer here to a person, but to things (qualities, virtues), implied although not expressed.

Page 12—1. 24. For *Tu n'as fait que* read: *Tu m'as fait, que*.

14—1. 22. "*Vous fouilliez bien*: You were digging well." To search well everywhere etc.

18—1. 6. "*Que je les eusse*." I do not understand what the "omission of *je*" has to do here. *Je* is not omitted.

20—1. 6. *C'est à qui* . . . because each wants to be the first." (?)

23—1. 20. *C'est une chose où vous ne me réduirez pas*. *Où* is still used in such sentences and is more elegant than "*à laquelle*."—But *où* standing for *que* in: *C'est dans cette occasion où je pourrais dire* (Mad. de Sévigné), is no longer allowable.

29—1. 4. "*Lorsqu'on s'offre de* . . . When every body." When anybody.

34—1. 31. No note for *Trou-Madame*, a game: Troll my dames, in which the players try to place balls in nine holes (Webster).

42—1. 22. The signing of the contract (before a notary-public) does not constitute to-day the civil marriage, which always takes place before the *maire* or the *adjoint*.

43—1. 15. No note for "*Orges mondés* or *orges perlés*, i. e., barley of which the husks have been removed. It is used in soups and to make cooling draughts.

43—1. 19. Why not explain *propreté* by *parure*?

48—1. 1. *Souper*. For *aufen* read *saufen*, and add: O.H.G. *sufan* cognate to *sop*.

57—1. 29. "*La chandelle*, the article indicating that every tallow-candle is separately set down."—No more than *le pain*; the article before *chandelle* generalises the meaning.

58—1. 20. *Lésine*. "In the xviith century a number of Italian cobblers formed a fraternity for purposes of economy, called *Lesina*, ostensibly by mending each other's shoes free of charge."—Certainly not Italian *cobblers*; why should they mend each other's shoes, and each not mend his own?

74—1. 12. *Un train*, "A retinue." *Un train* means here a costume.

CASIMIR ZDANOWICZ.

Vanderbilt University.

'NOT . . . NOR' OR 'NOT . . . OR.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS: I am at a loss to understand PROF. TOLMAN's remarks in your May number on my paper "*Not . . . Nor* or *Not . . . or*?" printed in February. If there was any one thing that I supposed I brought out clearly, it was that usage in regard to these collocations is to-day all but hopelessly divided. Hence, when PROF. TOLMAN says that "in most of the cases under discussion . . . good usage offers us two forms," he simply repeats what I proved by the most abundant citation.

Secondly, I cannot find anywhere in my paper the "suggestion that the best English has perhaps cast out *not . . . nor* in favor of *not . . . or*." I do say that the ordinary "double negative" (for example, "*I won't* have *nothing* to do with you") is now unquestionably bad, and I *propose* that *not . . . or* shall be substituted in certain cases for *not . . . nor*; but I do not even hint (for I never believed) that usage *has* cast out *not . . . nor* in any case.

Thirdly, PROF. TOLMAN's example, "Wealth does *not* always give power, *nor* do undeniable talents in all cases secure for the possessor even a moderate degree of worldly success," is the exact counterpart of the examples cited by me as those in which *not . . . nor must* be retained.

Finally, I fail to appreciate the increased emphasis of *nor* over *or* in such cases as, "Do not walk *nor* (*or*) trespass on the railroad." Surely, in 'In Memoriam,' C., cited by me in February, there is no difference between

No gray old grange, *or* lonely fold,

and

No gray old grange,

Nor hoary knoll of ash and haw.

The "suggestion" that I did make was that it might be worth while to *differentiate* the two expressions, writing *or* between the members of sentences and *nor* between independent *clauses*, *sentences*, and *paragraphs*. Nor can I see how this suggestion restricts the "freedom" of the language; it simply puts a general law in place of general license.

JNO. G. R. McELROY.

University of Pennsylvania.